

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to FIGS. 2A and 2B. These sheets, which include FIGS. 2A and 2B, replace the previously amended sheets including FIGS. 2A and 2B.

Attachment: 2 Replacement Sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Various amendments to the specification and new drawings are provided herewith to correct typographical errors. No new matter has been added.

Pending claims 4, 11 and 15 have been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2.

Pending claims 1-3, 8-10 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0014423 (Croome). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. As to claim 1, Croome nowhere teaches dynamically adjusting a number of time slots assigned to a wireless communication medium during data transmission to remain within limits of a desired level of service. In this regard, the Office Action concedes Croome nowhere teaches any dynamic adjustment to a number of time slots assigned to a medium during data transmission. Office Action, p. 5.

Nor do the other cited references anywhere teach or suggest such dynamic adjusting, although the Office Action contends that U.S. Patent No. 6,611,692 (Raffel) teaches this claimed subject matter:

In an analogous art, Raffel teaches 'Cordless cellular system', Further, Raffel teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: (a) determining a desired level of service (C6, L59-67, C7, L1-51); and (b) dynamically adjusting a number of time slots assigned to the medium during transmission to remain within limits of said desired level of service (C9, L61-67, C10, L1-20).

Office Action, p. 5.

However, neither these cited portions nor anywhere else in Raffel teach determining a desired level of service. Instead, Raffel teaches that a cellular transceiver 23 is a TDMA transceiver. While Raffel teaches that this single transceiver both receives mobile station transmissions and takes noise measurements (Raffel, col. 7), nowhere does Raffel teach determining a desired level of service. Nor does Raffel anywhere teach or suggest dynamically adjusting a number of time slots assigned to a medium during transmission to remain within the limits of the desired level of service. Instead, the cited portions of Raffel merely teach that a single TDMA frame includes multiple time slots, each of which is dedicated to a particular function. Raffel, col. 9, ln. 65-col. 10, ln. 63. Nowhere however does Raffel teach dynamically adjusting the number of time slots that are assigned to a given wireless communication medium,


or such dynamic adjusting during a transmission to remain within limits of a desired level of service. Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable over the cited art.

Independent claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Croome. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. As to claim 8, nowhere does Croome teach or suggest selecting one of first and second wireless media to act as a common medium and routing a data transmission through the common wireless medium. In this regard, the Office Action contends that wireless access mechanisms 104 and 1104 correspond to the first and second wireless media. Office Action, p. 3. However, nowhere does Croome anywhere teach or suggest that one of these mechanisms can be selected as a common medium through which data transmissions are routed. Rather, second mechanism 1104 is only mentioned in passing (Croome, ¶74), and nowhere is it taught or suggested that this mechanism (or first mechanism 104) can be used as a common medium for multiple wireless media. Instead, each access mechanism is dedicated to a different function and the transmissions through these media are independent and are not routed through a common wireless medium. Accordingly, claim 8 and the claims depending therefrom are patentable over Croome. For at least the same reasons, independent claim 12 and the claims depending therefrom are patentable.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 9, 2006



Mark J. Rozman
Registration No. 42,117
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024-1805
(512) 418-9944 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]
Customer No.: 21906